REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 15 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated November 26, 2007, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I.   Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Chankong for the courtesy of a telephone interview on January 11, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the claims as amended were not rendered obvious by the cited references, and the Examiner agreed. The Examiner further stated that a brief search on the art indicated that the claims would likely be allowable as amended if prosecution continued.

II.   Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated November 26, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6529187 ("*Dickelman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6009459 ("*Belfiore*") in further view of U.S. Pub. Patent App. No. 2002/0065910 ("*Dutta*") and further in view of

U.S. Patent No. 5706496 ("*Noguchi*"). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "configuring at least one automatic prefix and at least one automatic suffix associated with a geographic location of the mobile device wherein configuring the at least one automatic prefix and the at least one automatic suffix associated with the geographic location of the mobile device comprises storing the at least one automatic prefix and the at least one automatic suffix in a registry." Amended Claim 15 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 7, lines 15-24.

In contrast, *Dickelman* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Dickelman* merely discloses providing access to internet addresses using easily recognizable key sequences. (*See Dickelman*, col. 3, lines 12-15.) In *Dickelman*, letter combinations that are easily entered from a keypad are generated through a sequences selection of letters that corresponds to a first letter represented by a keyboard key. (*See* col. 4, lines 19-22.) For example, the "word" created by the key sequence is not meaningful, in and of itself. (*See* col. 4, lines 22-23.) However, in *Dickelman*, the importance lies not in the words themselves, but the sequence in the key navigation. (*See* col. 4, lines 23-25.) *Dickelman* further discloses that a character sequence of "PTWTP, when relying on an auto-complete feature, is translated into "WWW.PTWP.COM". *Dickelman* does not configure a device to add

automatic prefixes and suffixes to entered characters based on geographic location, however. Rather, *Dickelman* merely discloses translating a character sequence to add a specific prefix and suffix.

In addition, *Belfiore* does not overcome *Dickelman's* deficiencies. *Belfiore* merely discloses initiating a search for a resource such as a web site when a user has specified (entered) text that is not a valid identifier for the resource, e.g., a uniform resource locator (URL). (*See* col. 2, lines 12-16.) In *Belfiore*, a heuristic analysis is employed to determine when text entered by the user is presented in the format of a valid identifier such as a URL. (*See* col. 2, lines 16-18.) When the entered text is determined to not have a valid URL format, the text may be placed in a template to identify/determine the meaning of the entered text. (*See* col. 2, lines 18-21.) *Belfiore* further discloses making an attempt to construct a valid URL from processed text by prepending a scheme prefix such as "http://" if the text begins with "www". (*See* col. 6, lines 15-19.) Accordingly, like *Dickelman*, *Belfiore* at least does not disclose configuring a device to add automatic prefixes and suffixes to entered characters based on geographic location. Rather, *Belfiore* merely discloses adding prefixes to processed text according to a technical protocol.

Furthermore, *Dutta* does not overcome *Dickelman's* and *Belfiore's* deficiencies. *Dutta* merely discloses rendering network addresses and generating a list of previously accessed network addresses. (*See* Abstract.) *Dutta* further discloses that current web browsers provide an auto-complete feature that displays previously accessed URLs as the user types in a URL address. (*See* para. [0034].) However, like *Dickelman* and

Belfiore, Dutta at least does not disclose configuring a device to add automatic prefixes and suffixes to entered characters based on geographic location. Rather, *Dutta* merely discloses displaying a list of previously accessed network addresses.

Moreover, *Noguchi* does not overcome *Dickelman's, Belfiore's* and *Dutta's* deficiencies. *Noguchi* merely discloses finding a search string's occurrence in a character sequence. (*See* Abstract.) In *Noguchi,* prefix and suffix extensions are considered in respect to a word's substring. (*See* col. 30, lines 31-35.) *Noguchi* offers as example that "editor" is a two-way extension word with respect to the string "dit". (*See* col. 30, lines 31-35.) However, like *Dickelman, Belfiore,* and *Dutta, Noguchi* at least does not disclose configuring a device to add automatic prefixes and suffixes to entered characters based on geographic location. Rather, *Noguchi* merely discloses finding a search string's occurrence in a character sequence.

Combining *Dickelman, Belfiore,* and *Dutta* with *Noguchi* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Dickelman, Belfiore, Dutta,* and *Noguchi,* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "configuring an automatic prefix and an automatic suffix associated with a geographic location of the mobile device," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 15 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 15 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 15.

Dependent Claims 2-14 and 18-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 15, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-14 and 18-20.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: January 25, 2008

 /D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc:bjr

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

-14-